UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

L	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
•	10/679,667	10/06/2003	Bret A. Ferree	BAF-15102/29	4076
	²⁵⁰⁰⁶ GIFFORD, KR	7590 02/12/200 ASS, SPRINKLE,ANI	7 DERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C	ON & CITKOWSKI, P.C	
	PO BOX 7021		REIMERS, ANNETTE R		
	1 KOY, MI 480	TROY, MI 48007-7021		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3733	
_					
	SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERÝ MODE	
	3 MO	NTHS	02/12/2007	DAD	ED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		T	<u> </u>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/679,667	FERREE			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Annette R. Reimers	3733			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 November 2006</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2005 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Application/Control Number: 10/679,667

Art Unit: 3733

Į!

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,759,769) in view of Mehdizadeh (U.S. Patent Number 6,231,609), cited by examiner on 892, paper number 20041207.

Hedman et al. disclose various embodiments of a multiaxial artificial disc replacement comprising a lower component, 28, adapted for fixation to an inferior vertebral body, at 64, an upper component, 26, adapted for fixation to a superior vertebral body, at 46, an element, 72 and 74, that allows movement between the lower and upper components along only two separate, independent orthogonal axes, and wherein one of the axes is generally medial-lateral and the other axis is generally anterior-posterior (see figures 1, 2, 6 and 7 and column 4, lines 22-64, and column 5, lines 34-35).

Hedman et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the element being a cruciate-shaped axle. Mehdizadeh discloses a multiaxial artificial disc replacement comprising a lower component, 12, an upper component, 11, and an element, 19, between the components (see figure 2). Mehdizadeh further shows that the element can

be a coil spring, 19, or a cruciate-shaped spring, 54, (see figures 2, 9 and 10) and teaches that these are functionally equivalent structures (see column 4, lines 29-47, particularly lines 44-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Hedman et al. with the element being a cruciate-shaped spring instead of a coil spring, in view of Mehdizadeh, as such would merely constitute a substitution of functionally equivalent structures.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that it is unclear how a cruciate-shaped spring could be placed into the Hedman apparatus, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Furthermore, as stated above, Mehdizadeh discloses a multiaxial artificial disc replacement comprising a lower component, 12, an upper component, 11, and an element, 19, between the components (see figure 2). Mehdizadeh further shows that the element can be a coil spring, 19, or a cruciate-shaped spring, 54, (see figures 2, 9 and 10) and teaches that these are functionally equivalent structures (see column 4, lines 29-47, particularly lines 44-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Hedman et al. with the element being a cruciate-

shaped spring instead of a coil spring, in view of Mehdizadeh, as such would merely constitute a substitution of functionally equivalent structures.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette R. Reimers whose telephone number is (571) 272-7135. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/679,667 Page 5

Art Unit: 3733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR

EDUARDØ Ø. ROBERT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER